

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JASMINE PAUL SANCHEZ,

Case No. 3:22-cv-00076-ART-CSD

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

ELY STATE PRISON MEDICAL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Pro se Plaintiff Jasmine Paul Sanchez brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claiming that Defendants Jamie Ciciliano and Dawn Jones violated his Eighth Amendment rights and were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to give him access to a needed inhaler and failed to provide treatment and pain medication for a broken arm. Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge Craig S. Denney (ECF No. 56), recommending that Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 38) be granted. Plaintiff did not oppose Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff had until May 13, 2024 to file an objection to Judge Denney’s R&R. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R, and will grant Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment.

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis

1 in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that
2 the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the
3 record in order to accept the recommendation”).

4 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review
5 and is satisfied Judge Denney did not clearly err. Here, Judge Denney
6 recommends granting Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment because
7 Plaintiff has not provided any evidence on response to create a genuine dispute
8 of material fact on either of his claims. (ECF No. 56 at 7.) Plaintiff did not file a
9 response to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment pointing to any evidence
10 supporting his claims. The Court therefore agrees with Judge Denney. Having
11 reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the R&R in
12 full.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Judge Denney’s Report and
14 Recommendation (ECF No. 56) is accepted and adopted in full.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants’ Motion for Summary
16 Judgment (ECF No. 38) is GRANTED.

17 The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly.
18

19 DATED THIS 29th day of May 2024.
20

21 

22 ANNE R. TRAUM
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28